

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and new claims 16-23 are pending. The support in the published specification for the claim amendments and new claims are as follows: Claim 1: claim 2; Claim 8: claim 9; and new claims 16-23: [0021], [0025] and [0029]. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimoto et al (USPN 6143226). (Office Action, page2)

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended with the subject matter of claims 2 and 9 respectively, thereby making this rejection now moot.

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto et al. (Office Action, page2)

In general, the mold-clamping force to mold a resin material and the mold-clamping force to mold a coating material (the forth step in Claim 1, and the third step in Claim 8) are different. In particular, the mold-clamping force to mold the resin material is larger than the mold-clamping force to mold the coating material.

One of the most important characteristics of the claimed invention is that these forces are set so as to be same. Therefore, the mold-clamping force to mold the resin material is separated in two steps. Thus, in order to achieve the above-mentioned characteristic, the force to form a molded product (the second step) can be decreased.

In other words, one of the important objects of the claimed invention is to solve the problem of nonuniformity of the coating thickness. The problem is caused by difference of the amount of deformation of mold between the stages of molding the resin material and the molding the coating material.

The rejection states that clamping forces would have been determined from experimentation. However, the ratio of forces in multiple steps is nowhere disclosed or taught in Fujimoto. Because the relationship between steps is nowhere disclosed or even suggested, the applicants rebut the assertion of mere obviousness, because there is no basis to derive the experiments initially. Simply put, Fujimoto and the claimed invention are not directly comparable.

Not only does Fujimoto nowhere teach using a combination of substantially the same molding pressures, but it also does not teach opening the mold when the resin molded product solidifies to an extent to which the product can withstand the injecting pressure and flowing pressure of the coating material.

It is impossible for Fujimoto, alone, to create a *prima facie* rejection of obviousness. In other words, there is not enough disclosure upon which the skilled artisan would conclude obviousness of all pending claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: September 24, 2009

Customer No. 21874

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /James E. Armstrong, IV/
James E. Armstrong, IV
Registration No.: 42,266
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(202) 478-7375
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant